

### REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Allowed Claims

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 3 and 4 are allowed. However, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 2 and claims 5-7 also contain allowable subject matter and that the entire application should be passed to issuance.

COPY

#### Examiner Interview

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and professional courtesy during the interview held on August 12, 2003. During the interview a review of the features of the present invention was undertaken along with the disclosures of the references, in particular, the Zarros reference. The Examiner substantially agreed that the delays that are disclosed in Zarros are based on estimations. A general understanding was reached that the actual delayed arrival times claimed in the present invention are determined and used differently than the arrival times in Zarros. In accordance with an indication by the Examiner that clarification of the phrase "actual delay arrival time" may be appropriate, and in conformity with the spirit of the interview, claim 1 has now been amended to clarify the phrase "actual delay arrival time". Claim 1 has been amended to include the additional recitation:

"..., the actual delayed arrival time being an absolute difference between a known duration and the preferred duration of the multimedia objects."

The support for this amendment may be found at least at page 10, lines 9-22, and following, where it is shown that the absolute time of a certain label of a multimedia object will become known as label times are resolved during playback and factual multimedia object durations become available accordingly. Therefore, since the absolute time becomes known, it stands to reason that it cannot be an estimation.

Further support can be found in conjunction with the discussion on page 7, line 2 to page 10, where it is shown that the actual delays become known during playback and an absolute difference between a known duration and the preferred duration of the multimedia objects can be determined.

Applicants submit that Kim, Graf, and Zarros do not teach or suggest these features either separately or in combination and now request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the combination of Kim, Graf and Zarros do not teach or suggest all the features of the claimed. Further, Applicants submits that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance.

A Request for Continued Examination is being submitted simultaneously herewith to gain reconsideration of the amendment to claim 1. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Applicant hereby makes a written petition for extension of time if needed. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles J. Gross  
Registration No. 52, 972  
Andrew M. Calderon  
Registration No. 38,093

COPY

McGuireWoods, LLP  
1750 Tysons Blvd  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 712-5426

\\COM\195050.1